



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

under the circumstances, have done for himself. *Warnack v. State*, 129 Ga. 589, 60 S. E. 288; *Parnell v. State*, 51 Tex. Crim. 620, 98 S. W. 269.

If a brother at fault has retreated, or is excused from retreat by impossibility or drunkenness, then accused may exercise right of self-defense in behalf of his brother. *State v. Greer*, 22 W. Va. 800.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—INDEBTEDNESS—CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITATIONS.—By a constitutional provision indebtedness by municipal corporations in any year, in excess of the income and revenue for such year, was prohibited, except with the assent of two-thirds of the voters; and such indebtedness was limited to a certain percentage of the total value of taxable property at the assessment next before the last, previous to the incurring of the indebtedness. Under this provision, a bond issue was voted August 5, 1912, before the assessment for 1911 was completed. The assessment for 1911 was completed September 1, 1912. Bonds were issued October 2, 1912, after the assessment for 1911 was completed. Assessments for 1909 and 1910 were complete. The assessment for 1910 warranted the issuance of bonds, but the assessment for 1909 did not, as the assessed value at that time was insufficient. The State Auditor having refused to register the bonds, a proceeding by mandamus was instituted to compel the registration of the bonds. *Held*, the assessment of 1911, which was incomplete at the time the bonds were voted, could not be considered; but the assessment for 1909 should have been the basis of computation, and hence the bond issue, being in excess of the legal limit as shown by the assessment of 1909, is void. *State ex rel. City of Dexter v. Gordon* (Mo.), 158 S. W. 683. See NOTES, p. 74.

PARTNERSHIP REALTY—CONVERSION.—On a bill filed for the dissolution and administration of assets of a partnership at will, formed for the purpose of buying and selling real estate, it was, *held*, the partnership is terminable at any time by notice given by either partner, and the filing of a bill for dissolution is such notice; and upon dissolution, the partnership realty is to be considered as personalty as to the partnership, partners, and creditors of the firm, but for all other purposes it is realty. *Fooks v. Williams* (Md.), 87 Atl. 692. See NOTES, p. 68.

PENDENTE LITE PURCHASER—EFFECT OF COMPROMISE.—Plaintiff sued out an attachment against the property of S, and filed a statutory notice of *lis pendens*. The claim asserted in the proceeding was compromised by S's agreeing to convey the attached property to plaintiff. No judgment was entered, other than an entry of the court's approval of the compromise. Pending this action, and before the compromise, S conveyed the property to M, for value and without actual notice of the attachment. In a suit by plaintiff against M to remove M's claim as a cloud from his title, *held*, the *pendente lite* purchaser took subject only to the right of the plaintiff to a sale of the property under a judgment entered in the attachment proceedings, and within the issues made; and therefore unaffected by the compromise agreement. *Glattli v. Bradford* (Miss.), 62 So. 643.